

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 6-10, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al in view of Hasegawa.

The present invention is for an apparatus which is useful both as an illumination element and a touch screen (see page 2, lines 9-12).

Hasegawa is for the different problems of ease of assembly, reduction in size and collecting and returning the light beam to the sending elements (col. 2, lines 7-11). Thus it is improper to combine Hasegawa with Graham to solve the problems the present invention solves.

Further, claim 1 now recites only a single source of illumination as suggested by the Examiner on page 7 of the last office action. Since this is not shown or suggested by either of the references, even if somehow they are combined, the result is not the present invention. Thus the rejection of claims 1-5, 6-10, 13 and 17 should be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of Hasegawa as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Kubo et al.

Kubo is for the problems of improved coordinate recognition and improved brightness (see col. 3, lines 23-33). Since this is different than the problems solved by the present invention, it cannot be combined with Hasegawa and/or Graham.

More importantly, it fails to disclose the claimed only a single source of illumination. In particular, Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 15-19, show two light sources 402 and 404. Thus even if Kubo is

somehow combined with the first two references, the result is not the present invention. Thus the rejection of claims 14 and 18-26 should be withdrawn.

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 USAC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham in view of Hasegawa as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Selbrede.

Selbrede is for the problems of filtration, secondary emissive effects, light generating means and improved pixels (see col. 2, lines 10-15). Since this is different from that of the present invention, Selbrede cannot be combined with the first two references.

Further, it clearly shows three illumination sources 116a, 116b, and 116c in Fig. 2 and not the claims only a single illumination source. Thus even if it is somehow combined with the first two references, the result is not the present invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$1,020.00 is enclosed for a 3 month extension of time fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler
Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

Feb. 24, 2005
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 2/24/05

Signature: Doris W. Perman
Person Making Deposit